



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,874	03/15/2002	Merle Leland Green	LUC-322/Green 1-1-1-2-32	5365

32205 7590 04/10/2003

PATTI & BRILL  
ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET  
44TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60602

EXAMINER

SING, SIMON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/099,874

Applicant(s)

GREEN ET AL.

Examiner

Simon Sing

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a) US Patent application number is missing in line 6, page 1.
  - b) Description in lines 13-16, page 1 is confusing. In line 13, the applicants disclose that a first user (caller) places a call to a second user (called party), but in lines 14-16, the applicants state that if the first user (caller) is unavailable, the second user (called party) leaves a voicemail message for the first user (caller). In a standard voicemail system, it should be the first user (caller) leaves a voicemail message for the second user (called party), not the other way around.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Porter US 5,963,618.

Art Unit: 2645

2.1 Regarding claim 1, Porter discloses a voice processing system in figure 5. Porter teaches using a voicemail system component [voice processing unit 520] to invite a caller to leave a voicemail message (column 11, lines 12-19) and storing the voicemail message on a depository [mailbox of voicemail system 542] through an Internet (column 11, lines 52-67).

2.2 Regarding claim 2, Porter teaches that the voicemail system component 520 employs an address to store the voicemail message in a mailbox (column 11, lines 39-43).

2.3 Regarding claim 4, Porter teaches a plurality of VM 542-546 for storing voice messages, and each VM is a file server (able to store or retrieve a voice data file). Porter also teaches using separate voicemail system components 520 (column 14, lines 33-42), wherein a first voicemail system component 520 is able to store or access a first voicemail message on a VM, and a second voicemail system component 520 is able to store or access a second voicemail message on another VM.

2.4 Regarding claim 5, Porter teaches that though the voicemail system component 520, a user is able to retrieve the voicemail message through Internet (column 14, lines 33-42). It is inherent that once the voicemail message is accessed, it can be forwarded or deleted.

2.5 Regarding claim 6, Porter teaches that the voicemail system component 520 has a database for each subscriber, wherein each data base has a pointer [mailbox number or voice mail address] (column 11, lines 39-43, Table 1).

2.6 Regarding claim 7, Porter teaches that the voicemail system component 520 has a database for each subscriber, wherein each database has a mailbox address (column 11, lines 39-43, Table 1). Porter further teaches using multiple separate voicemail system component 520 for each subscriber (column 14, lines 33-42). It is inherent that a subscriber has a first database in a first voicemail system component 520 and a second database in a second voicemail system component 520' with the same voicemail address.

2.7 Regarding claim 8, Porter teaches that the voicemail system component 520 has a database for each subscriber, wherein each data base has a pointer [mailbox number or voice mail address] (column 11, lines 39-43, Table 1).

2.8 Regarding claim 9, Porter teaches that the voicemail system component 520 has a database which comprises link lists to mailboxes in VM 542-546 (column 11, lines 39-43, Table 1).

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Donovan et al. US 6,396,908.

3.1 Regarding claim 1, O'Donovan discloses a message transfer system in figure 1. O'Donovan's system comprising voicemail system component 16, to store a voicemail messages on a depository 26 (column 6, lines 32-44, 61-67; column 7, lines 1-7). The voicemail system component 16 and the depository are coupled through Internet 40 (Figure 1).

3.2 Regarding claim 2, O'Donovan teaches employing an address of location by voicemail system component 16 to store the voicemail message (column 7, lines 1-7).

3.3 Regarding claim 3, O'Donovan teaches employing an address of location by the depository 26 to identity a mailbox on the voicemail component 16 (column 8, lines 18-30).

3.4 Regarding claim 11, O'Donovan teaches multiple voicemail systems interconnected by networks, and each mailbox in a repository comprises a linked list to the addresses of other mailboxes in other voicemail systems. Each mailbox is associated with a recipient of a voicemail message (column 8, lines 18-30).

4. Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter US 6,282,270.

4.1 Regarding claim 1, Porter discloses a world wide web voicemail system in figure 3. Porter's system comprises a voicemail system component [WWW CLIENT 310] for retrieving a voicemail message from a storage device [VOICE DB 390] through Internet (Abstract; column 5, lines 26-37; column 6, 20-32).

4.2 Regarding claim 12, Porter teaches that a voice mailbox may store only logical information of voicemail messages, and the physical voicemail messages may be stored elsewhere (column 5, lines 7-18). Porter also teaches deleting a voicemail message by deleting a hyperlink [reference] to the voicemail message from a voice mailbox (column 30-47).

5. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arumainayagam et al. US 5,659,599.

Arumainayagam discloses a voice mail network and networking method in figures 1-3. Arumainayagam teaches receiving a voicemail message in a remote voicemail system (column 4, lines 43-53), forwarding the voicemail message to a local voicemail system (column 5, lines 7-22). Arumainayagam also teaches coping the address header information [sender's name and telephone number, recipient's name

and telephone number] of the voicemail message to the local voicemail system (column 5, lines 18-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter US 5,963,618 in view of Finnigan US 6,181,780.

Porter teaches using a database to access a voicemail message in a depository through Internet, but fails to teach that the database includes an encryption key.

However, Finnigan discloses a telephonic voice message store and forward system and method in figure 1, Finnigan teaches using privacy device to encrypt a voice message (column 6, lines 6-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Porter's reference with the teaching of Finnigan so that a voicemail message would have been encrypted and the database would have comprised a encryption key for encryption and de-encryption the voicemail message, because such a modification would have enhanced security and privacy of the voicemail message.



7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Donovan et al. US 6,396,908 in view of Arumainayagam et al. US 5,659,599.

O'Donovan teaches recording a voicemail message in a first mailbox and forwarding the voicemail message to a second mailbox [depository] through Internet, but fails to specifically teach that forwarding includes copying an address of the voicemail to from the first mailbox to the second mailbox.

However, Arumainayagam discloses a voice mail network and networking method in figures 1-3. Arumainayagam teaches receiving a voicemail message in a remote voicemail system (column 4, lines 43-53), forwarding the voicemail message to a local voicemail system (column 5, lines 7-22). Arumainayagam also teaches coping the address header information [sender's name and telephone number, recipient's name and telephone number] of the voicemail message to the local voicemail system (column 5, lines 18-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify O'Donovan's reference with the teaching of Arumainayagam so that an address of a voicemail message would have been copied from a first mailbox to a second mailbox, because such a modification would have kept a recipient of the second mailbox informed of the address of the sender of the voicemail message.

8. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arumainayagam et al. US 5,659,599 in view of Porter US 5,963,618.

Arumainayagam teaches receiving a voicemail message in a remote voicemail system (column 4, lines 43-53), forwarding the voicemail message to a local voicemail system (column 5, lines 7-22). Arumainayagam also teaches coping the address header information [sender's name and telephone number, recipient's name and telephone number] of the voicemail message to the local voicemail system (column 5, lines 18-22). Arumainayagam further teaches changing correspondence of the voicemail message from first mailbox in the remote voicemail system to the second mailbox in the local voicemail system (column 6, lines 18-23). Arumainayagam teaches coupling voicemail systems through a PSTN network, or a private network, but fails to teach coupling through an Internet.

However, Porter teaches that voicemail systems are coupled through an Internet (figure 5; column 11, lines 3-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Arumainayagam's reference with the teaching of Porter so that a voicemail system would have been coupled through Internet, because such a modification would have enabled voicemail systems to exchange voicemail messages through Internet to avoid tolls.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Sing whose telephone number is (703) 305-3221. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached at (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.



S.S.

04/04/2003

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

